

**U.S.S.N. 10/780,029 (DP-309791) - 9**

**REMARKS**

The claims of this application stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) or 35 USC 103(b) over prior art showing navigation systems that display routes determined from a predetermined (generally operator-entered), desired destination. In these references, both steps of determining the route and displaying a portion of the route are dependent upon the predetermined, desired destination. In every reference, one of the most important determinants of what is shown is the predetermined destination that has been entered by the vehicle operator. Likewise, the displays of points of interest generally include an indication of this same predetermined destination. For example, in both Adachi and Schmischke et al, every figure showing a display provides an arrow marking a turn required to get to a desired location. But applicants' system is not a system for navigating one's way to a desired destination. It is, rather, a system to display points of interest along whatever road one is traveling, in whatever direction one is traveling, with no predetermined destination. Thus, applicants have amended their claims to emphasize this difference. They have added limitations to the steps of determining a point of interest and communicating the point of interest that these steps are done "without reference to any predetermined destination." In addition, applicants have amended those claims formerly reciting a "navigation" system to recite a "point of interest display" system.

To further elaborate this difference, Examiner is invited to consider the case in the prior art wherein the vehicle has a heading in a direction away from a predetermined destination that has been entered by the vehicle operator. The prior art system will determine the vehicle's location and heading; but the system's choice of what point of interest to display and how to display it will be most affected by the need to instruct the vehicle operator to change his direction to a heading in a direction toward the predetermined direction. This is useful to

**U.S.S.N. 10/780,029 (DP-309791) - 10**

help the vehicle operator get to the predetermined direction, but it is not what applicants are claiming.

In contrast to the prior art example of the previous paragraph, applicants' claimed system determines the location and heading of the vehicle but they displays information on points of interest in general, in the vicinity or the heading direction of the vehicle. While the vehicle operator may be able to choose specific classes or kinds of points of interest (intersections, public buildings, parks, etc.) the system is not confined by a requirement to direct the vehicle operator to any predetermined destination but is free to simply display whatever points of interest are identified based on the vehicle's location and heading. Any direction arrows displayed, such as that in Figure 4 of the application, indicates only the vehicle's current heading and is not displayed in order to direct the vehicle operator to change heading toward a predetermined destination.

Of course, applicants' inventive system and method could be added as a useful addition to a vehicle navigation system, with the prior art navigation functions being separately operable with or without prior use of applicants' system to identify points of interest as possible destinations for selection, but applicants are not claiming the prior art functions.

Applicants do not see their apparatus or method of the claims now presented in any of the cited references; and they thus request, in view of their amendments herein, that the rejection be withdrawn and the application be allowed to proceed to issue or further search and examination as appropriate.

Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0831.

**U.S.S.N. 10/780,029 (DP-309791) - 11**

Respectfully submitted,



---

Robert M. Sigler  
Attorney - Reg. No. 26,505  
(248) 813-1245